

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are amended herein. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-21 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-10 and 13-17 have been amended as requested by the Examiner to correct these informalities. Therefore, the objection to claims 1-21 should be withdrawn accordingly.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 15-21 have been amended to overcome this rejection, and the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection should be withdrawn accordingly.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the U.S. Patent No. 7,003,280 (Pelaez) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,006,508 (Bondy). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following discussion.

For a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103, the MPEP § 706.02(j) requires the Examiner to either present references that “expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention” or put forth “a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” For at least the reasons stated

below, Pelaez and Bondy, neither separately nor in combination, teach all aspects of the claims. In addition, the Examiner has not put forth “a convincing line of reasoning as to why the claimed invention is obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” Therefore, the Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

Independent claim 8 recites a method of operating a comprehensive signaling node comprising receiving a signaling communication. The signaling communication is then processed with a Media Gateway Controller routine, a Session Initiation Protocol routine, a Session Border Controller routine, a Push-To-Talk routine, an H.323 routine, a Wide Area Network compression routine, or a Communication Assistance for Law Enforcement routine. Specifically, only one signaling communication is received (“*the* signaling communication”), and thus, processing with the Media Gateway Controller routine, the Session Initiation Protocol routine, the Session Border Controller routine, the Push-To-Talk routine, the H.323 routine, the Wide Area Network compression routine, and the Communication Assistance for Law Enforcement routine occurs on a single platform.

In contrast, Pelaez discloses an IP multimedia subsystem wherein a call session control function (CSCF) 22 routes incoming calls and provides service trigger mechanisms to invoke services through application servers 24 (Pelaez, col. 5, lines 20-35; and Figure 1). CSCF 22 interacts with border gateway control function (BGCF) 28, multimedia resource function controller (MRFC) 32, media gateway control function (MGCF) 26, and multimedia resource function processor (MRFP) 30 to process incoming communications and provide various services (Pelaez, col. 5, lines 20-35). Pelaez does not disclose multiple processing routines on a single platform, as required by claim 8. Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 8, and the rejection should be withdrawn accordingly.

Further, Pelaez and Bondy, both separately and in combination, fail to disclose a Push-To-Talk routine, an H.323 routine, or a WAN compression routine, as required by claim 8.

The Examiner asserts that the wireline network disclosed in Pelaez is equivalent to the Push-To-Talk routine and the Wide Area Network compression routine recited in claim 8 (OA, p. 4). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Pelaez makes no mention of a Push-To-Talk routine or a Wide Area Network compression routine, as required by claim 8. In fact, Pelaez merely teaches a wireline network that may be employed to operatively connect a communication device to a public data network. There is no indication in Pelaez that the wireline network is equivalent to a Push-To-Talk routine or a Wide Area Network compression routine.

Based upon the above comments, the combination of Pelaez and Bondy does not expressly or impliedly suggest all of the limitations of claim 8. Furthermore, the Examiner has not put forth a convincing line of reasoning as to why the claimed invention is obvious in light of the teachings of the references. The Applicant therefore asserts that claim 8 is not obvious in view of the prior art and is allowable. Such indication by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1 and 15 contain limitations similar to claim 8 and are allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

The dependent claims, while separately allowable, depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant, therefore, refrains from a discussion of these dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

With respect to dependent claim 2, the Examiner fails to address the limitations of a comprehensive signaling node with a storage system being configured to store an enable/disable system and with a processing system being configured to receive a configuration command, with

the configuration command specifying an enable or disable operation for one or more specified signaling routines. Further, the Examiner fails to put forth a convincing line of reasoning as to why claim 2 is obvious in light of the teachings of the references. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 2 is allowable over the art of record and such indication is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interest of clarity and brevity. The Applicant thus respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine that fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shannon L. Silversmith/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Shannon L. Silversmith, Reg. No. 60,938

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe

Sprint Law Department

6450 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461

Overland Park, KS 66251